

The President says this is the people's money. He is exactly right about that. This is the people's money. But do you know what? It is also the people's debt. It is also the people's Social Security. It is also the people's Medicare. All of those are the people's. The policy he has fashioned is taking Social Security trust fund surpluses from the people in order to pay for a tax cut; taking from a circumstance in which people are paying payroll taxes—by the way, 80 percent of American taxpayers pay more in payroll tax than they pay in income tax—it is going to take from their trust fund surpluses and use it to give an income tax cut that flows overwhelmingly to the wealthiest among us. You talk about Robin Hood in reverse, this is it. It is not good economic policy, it is not good tax policy, it is not good fiscal policy, and it is going to put us in a deeper and deeper hole.

The Joint Committee on Taxation said this about the plan:

This stimulus is reduced over time because the consumption, labor, and investment incentives are temporary, and because the positive business investment incentives arising from the tax policy are eventually likely to be outweighed by the reduction in national savings due to increased Federal Government deficits.

That is exactly what is wrong with this plan. It is not the economic growth plan, it is a plan to borrow from the future and to take Social Security trust fund surpluses and give a big tax cut to those who are the wealthiest among us.

This plan also flunks the fairness test. The plan benefits the wealthiest in a way that is truly stunning. Taxpayers with income over \$1 million will get a benefit of \$73,790 in this tax year alone. The typical taxpayers—those in the middle income in this country, the 20 percent of taxpayers who are in the middle of the income distribution—will have an average benefit of \$245.

Let me conclude by saying I hope my colleagues will take a second look at what was passed. I think it is going to prove to be a serious mistake for our fiscal future.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, am I recognized for 10 minutes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

GLOBAL AIDS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last Thursday and early Friday morning, the Senate was in session for I believe 17 hours, and it took 36 rollcall votes. Many of us arrived at our homes at 1:30 or 2 in the morning. I had trouble sleeping despite the hour because of what happened on that day. I want to describe something that has bothered me all weekend.

In the middle of discussing the tax vote that came to us from the Finance

Committee, the majority leader brought up the global AIDS bill. I guess it was about 10 o'clock at night. Those of us who prepared to offer amendments were told by the majority leader twice on the floor of the Senate that we would be able to offer our amendments and they would defeat them. Understand that this is a global AIDS bill that was done in committee, and none of us who do not serve on that committee had an opportunity to deal with that subject.

Yet we were told in the Senate we would be able to offer our amendments and they would defeat them. This was about 10 o'clock at night. We were, by the way, at that moment debating a \$430 billion or \$450 billion tax cut. And I proposed an amendment to the global AIDS bill to spend \$250 million—one-fourth of a billion dollars—to address a famine, particularly in central and sub-Saharan Africa, that threatens 11 million people. But before we had a debate about the substance of that, we were told: Your amendments will be defeated. Why? Because they are not a priority.

We had already passed the level of food aid that was proposed in my amendment previously. That \$250 million was already passed by the Senate in the omnibus bill and taken out by the House of Representatives in conference. But we were told we didn't have the capability in the Senate to do it last Thursday. So we had a record vote. I lost 49 to 51.

Just so we understand this is not about some abstract theory, let me read Nicholas Kristof's piece in the New York Times of May 13.

Ladawi is a 16-month-old girl with twigs for limbs, blotched skin, labored breathing, eyes that roll back and skin stretched tautly over shoulder blades that look as if they belong to a survivor of Auschwitz. She is so malnourished that she cannot brush away the flies that land on her eyes, and she does not react when a medical trainee injects drugs into her hip in a race to save her life.

"She's concerned only with trying to breathe," says the trainee, the closest thing to a doctor at a remote medical center here in southern Ethiopia. "Most likely she will not survive."

I don't understand this. I just do not understand. We have people dying, children dying, and we have substantial food in this country and the most productive farmers in the world. They are told at the grain elevator that food has no value. If you produce it in such abundance, it has no value. And then a young girl in Boricha, Ethiopia, lies on her bed dying because she doesn't have food.

I served on the Hunger Committee when I served in the House. I have traveled to many spots in the world to refugee camps. I have seen desperate hunger. I have held in my arms children who were dying because they didn't have enough to eat. We live in a world of plenty—at least here in the United States. Obesity is a major problem. A substantial part of our country is on a diet. Our farmers can't make a

living because they are told their food has no value. Yet we have 11 million people at risk. This Senate says no to the food aid that needs to go to those kids, to help those kids. I just do not understand it.

Let me read further from the Nicholas Kristof piece:

We've all been distracted by Iraq, but an incipient famine in the Horn of Africa has been drastically worsening just in the last few weeks. It has garnered almost no attention in the West, partly because it's not generally realized that people are already dying here in significant numbers. But they are. And unless the West mobilizes further assistance immediately to Ethiopia, Eritrea and Somalia, the toll could be catastrophic. . . .

"We've been overwhelmed by this, especially in the last three weeks," said Tigist Esatu, a nurse at the Yirba Health Center, crowded with mothers carrying starving children. "Some families come and say, 'We've lost two children already, three children already, so you must save this one.'"

He continues:

Since weapons of mass destruction haven't turned up so far in Iraq, there's been a revisionist suggestion that the American invasion was worthwhile because of humanitarian gains for the liberated Iraqi people. Fair enough. But as long as we're willing to send hundreds of thousands of troops to help Iraqis, what about offering much more modest assistance to save the children dying here?

"How is it that we routinely accept a level of suffering and hopelessness in Africa that we would never accept in any other part of the world?" asks James Morris, the executive director of the World Food Program. . . .

Fair enough. But as long as we're willing to send hundreds of thousands of troops to help Iraqis, what about offering much more modest assistance to save the children dying here?

Later in the article he quotes a mother:

"Now I worry about my other children," said Tadilech Yuburo, a young woman who lost one child last month and has three left. In her village, Duressa, population 300, five children have died in the last month. In nearby Falamu, population 400, six children have died. This famine has not yet registered on the world's conscience.

I offered an amendment to provide some food aid which we have in abundance. We have plenty of food aid to give. I offered an amendment at 10, 11 at night. We didn't have the time to do that, didn't have the willingness to do that. We didn't have the votes to do that. We were way too busy providing tax cuts, the majority of which will go to upper income Americans.

I had a friend who died of a car crash in 1981. He was a wonderful man, a singer, named Harry Chapin, who dedicated most of his life to fighting rural hunger. Harry wrote a song I want to read that describes why I feel so passionately about this. The song is called "The Shortest Story."

I am born today. The sun burns its promise in my eyes. Momma strikes me and I draw a breath to cry. Far above a cloud tumbles softly through the sky. It is now my seventh day. I taste the hunger and I cry. Brother and sister cling to momma's side. She squeezes her breast, but it has nothing to provide. Someone weeps. I fall asleep. It is 20

days today. Momma does not hold me anymore. I open my mouth but I am too weak to cry. Far above a bird slowly crawls across the sky. Why is there nothing left to do but die?

Those were lyrics by the late Harry Chapin. Harry was a terrific friend. He dedicated the proceeds from one-half of his concerts every year to fight world hunger. He used to say, if one night 45,000 people died of hunger in New Jersey, it would make headlines around the world, giant headlines in every paper in the world. But the winds of hunger blow every day, every hour, every minute, and 45,000 people, mostly children, die every day, and it doesn't make the newspaper.

Now we have a gripping famine in a part of the world that some of us believe we have a moral responsibility to address in a much more aggressive way than we have been willing to address previously. Yet a relatively small amendment I offered on Thursday was defeated by two votes, and I was told before I offered it: Go ahead and offer your amendment. We will defeat it. And this was before they knew what the amendment was about.

That is not the kind of priority you would expect from the Senate. I regret very much that we passed this global AIDS bill and did not attach the \$250 million in food aid to which the Senate had previously agreed. We don't have much time if we care about world hunger. If we care about saving these children, if we care about doing what we need to do, what our responsibility would call us to do at this moment, then we must regroup and pass legislation of the type I offered Thursday night.

Again, it was hard to sleep, and this weekend I thought a lot about that, wondering why was the Senate so much more interested in providing tax cuts than it was in providing assistance to those starving in other parts of the world.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WARNER. Parliamentary inquiry: Would the Chair advise the Senate with regard to the time remaining in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 9 minutes remaining to the majority in morning business.

Mr. WARNER. I judge no time remaining for the minority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. On behalf of the majority leader, I ask now that all time be yielded back on behalf of the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is yielded back. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to consideration of S. 1050, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1050) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that William Buhrow, a legislative fellow in the office of Senator GEORGE ALLEN, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1050.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jason Hamm, of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of the debate on the fiscal year 2004 defense authorization.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the staff members of the Committee on Armed Services, majority and minority, appearing on the list I send to the desk be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1050.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Judith A. Ansley; Richard D. DeBobs; Charles W. Alsop; Kenneth Barbee; Michael N. Berger; June M. Borawski; Leah C. Brewer; Jennifer D. Cave; L. David Cherington; Christine E. Cowart; Daniel J. Cox, Jr.; Madelyn R. Creedon; Kenneth M. Crosswait; Marie Fabrizio Dickinson; Gabriella Eisen; Evelyn N. Farkas.

Richard W. Fieldhouse; Andrew W. Florell; Brian R. Green; Creighton Greene; William C. Greenwalt; Carolyn M. Hanna; Mary Alice A. Hayward; Jeremy L. Hekhuis; Ambrose R. Hock; Gary J. Howard; R. Andrew Kent; Jennifer Key; Gregory T. Kiley; Maren R. Leed; Gerald J. Leeling; Peter K. Levine.

Patricia L. Lewis; Thomas L. MacKenzie; Sara R. Mareno; Ann M. Mittermeyer; Lucian L. Niemeyer; Cindy Pearson; Paula J. Philbin; Lynn F. Rusten; Arun A. Seraphin; Joseph T. Sixeas; Christina D. Still; Scott W. Stucky; Mary Louise Wagner; Richard F. Walsh; Nicholas W. West; Bridget M. Whalan; Pendred K. Wilson.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCCAIN's legislative fellow, Navy Commander Edward Cowan, be granted privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1050.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Michi-

gan on the floor. I advise my good friend and partner on this venture that I will proceed for some 10 minutes and then yield the floor, on the assumption that he will proceed, and then I will resume with the remainder of my statement.

On behalf of the Armed Services Committee, I am pleased and honored to bring the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 to the Senate for consideration. The bill was reported out of the committee with overwhelming bipartisan support. I may say, as a tribute to excellent staff work and excellent work by the chairman and ranking members of the subcommittees and, indeed, by the full cooperation of my distinguished colleague, the ranking member, we achieved this markup in what is regarded to be record time. I didn't keep the time, but I certainly recognize that we did it in a very brief period; basically over a 2-day period, where many times heretofore it has been 3, 4, and 5 days for markup.

I think the committee, both members and staff, were aware of the tremendous support across this Nation by the people for the men and women of the Armed Forces today and a recognition of the responsibilities of the Congress of the United States—in this case the Senate—to provide for those men and women of the Armed Forces.

Having said that, I believe that contributed to the swift action we had on our bill in committee markup, and I anticipate—I say this respectfully—in the Chamber a number of amendments will come forth, but I believe we will be able to complete this bill in a relatively short period of time, owing again to the support in the Chamber for the men and women of the Armed Forces and the desire to have a strong bill in place to go to conference with the House.

As we stand here beginning the debate on this bill today, over 300,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, Active Guard and Reserve, and countless civilians who support them, are serving bravely in not just the Persian Gulf region but Afghanistan.

It is remarkable. I want to mention the civilians. I recently said to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld, when we talked about the total force concept, I remembered so well that that concept was originated when Melvin Laird was Secretary of Defense and I was privileged to serve as the Secretary of the Navy during the Vietnam war. I said to Mr. Rumsfeld recently that we really ought to broaden the term "total force" now to incorporate the many civilians who quite often are in positions of personal risk and other situations not unlike those of the men and women of the Armed Forces, right up on the point of the spear of military action.

In my judgment, they are just as much a part of the total force as the uniformed contingent, and I think the uniformed contingent would want me